NPT/CONF.2005/SR.10

2005 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

15 June 2005

Original: English

Summary record of the 10th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 6 May 2005, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. de Queiroz Duarte ..... (Brazil)

Contents

General debate (*continued*)

Election of Vice-Presidents

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

05-33595 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

General debate (*continued*)

1. **Mr. Ugarte** (Costa Rica) said that, while the declared nuclear Powers and other States with nuclear capability or aspirations were mainly responsible for the lack of progress in non-proliferation and disarmament since the 2000 Review Conference, the responsibility was shared to some extent by all States. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) had no active mechanism for implementation except the Review Conferences held every five years. His delegation therefore supported the proposal contained in the working paper of Canada (NPT/CONF.2005/PC.III/WP.1) to hold annual meetings to take any necessary action on issues relating to the Treaty and to authorize the Bureau to call emergency sessions in the event of a threat to its integrity or viability.

2. The Treaty also lacked mechanisms for verification and execution, with the exception of article III, which required States parties to sign safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Although the Treaty did not expressly give a mandate to the Security Council, the Statute of the IAEA gave its Board of Governors the authority to refer cases of non-compliance with safeguards to the Security Council. Although the case of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had been brought before the Security Council in 1993 and 2003, it had taken no action because of divergent views among the five permanent members. The adoption of resolution 1540 (2004) had been a positive step, but it should be borne in mind that the Council could adopt binding measures only with reference to specific situations or disputes. The additional protocols were essential for transparency and mutual trust, but regrettably only 66 States had signed such instruments, and of the 77 States with significant nuclear programmes 11 still had not signed a protocol. The international community must establish more rigorous verification systems through every available legal avenue.

3. The slow progress in implementing the 13 practical steps adopted at the 2000 Review Conference was a cause for concern, as was the lack of commitment shown by the nuclear Powers in the area of disarmament. Costa Rica called for the de-alerting and dismantling of nuclear arsenals and rejected any justification for delay based on the concept of nuclear deterrence. Such reasoning ran counter to the Treaty and undermined efforts to achieve non-proliferation.

4. The Treaty of Tlatelolco, establishing the first inhabited region free of nuclear weapons, was an example to the world. Costa Rica encouraged efforts to establish such zones in Central Asia and the Middle East.

5. As the first country to comply fully with General Assembly resolution 41 (I) of 14 December 1946 on Principles governing the general regulation and reduction of armaments, Costa Rica welcomed the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice to the effect that an obligation existed to hold negotiations in good faith aimed at achieving complete nuclear disarmament under a strict and effective international verification system. It deeply regretted that neither the resolution nor the Court's opinion had been implemented and would therefore, along with the delegation of Malaysia, once again submit a working paper to follow up on the Court's opinion.

6. In conclusion, he expressed his delegation's unconditional support for the recommendations contained in the Secretary-General's report "In larger freedom", which provided a framework for action for replacing a peace based on the deterrent power of terror with a genuine peace.

7. **Mr. Celarie** (El Salvador) said that, especially in the years since the 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States of America, a transition had taken place towards a new global consensus on security, which had come to be viewed as interdependent with human rights, peace, development and democracy. Only through collective action could the international community respond immediately and effectively to global problems.

8. However, the aspirations of the majority of States to a world free from fear and the threat of weapons of mass destruction had to contend with the real world, where some States had the ability and advanced technological development to design new and more powerful weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons. Those States supported and implemented their doctrines and policies through military might, to the detriment of the common interests of humanity.

9. From the point of view of his delegation, a more secure world for both nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-

weapon States could be achieved only through the total elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. The United Nations could not be held responsible for the lack of progress in disarmament, as it must be stressed that the Member States were truly responsible for their actions and must demonstrate the political will to reach that objective. If denuclearization was to succeed, all States must comply fully with the treaties they had signed and must take new steps to revitalize the multilateral framework to address those threats. Moreover, Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) should provide a basis for negotiating a binding international instrument to prevent non-State actors from gaining access to weapons of mass destruction.

10. It should always be kept in mind that the entire planet would be affected by the devastating effects of nuclear weapons. There would be no winners or losers in a nuclear conflict; no political objective could justify their use. Therefore, nuclear disarmament should be an absolute and universal priority.

11. In conclusion, he paid tribute to the Government of Mexico for hosting the first Conference of States Parties and Signatories to Treaties establishing Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones.

Election of Vice-Presidents

12. **The President** said that the Group of Non-Aligned and Other States had endorsed the candidacy of Gabon for the post of Vice-President.

13. *The candidacy of Gabon for the post of Vice-President of the Conference was approved.*

The meeting rose at 3.50 p.m.